

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,265	11/17/2003	Thomas Pun	APLE.P0037	6487
62224 7590 071122010 ADELL & TOLLEN, LLP 11940 San Vicente Blvd., Suite 100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90049			EXAMINER	
			WERNER, DAVID N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Rule 312 Communication -

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/716,265	PUN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
David N. Werner	2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

a) ☐ entered. b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention. c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below. e) ☑ entered in part. See explanation below. Applicant has submitted three proposed Rule 312 Amendments to the specification after the Notice of Allowance of 13 May 2010. The first is an amendment or plage 5: line 32 — page 6: line 10. The first amendment is DENIED. Applicant indicates that "a new "Related Applications" section is to be inserted in the specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the "Related Applications is error. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be DENIED. See MPEP § 714.16. The second amendment is ENTERED. This amendment appears to only correct a typographical error, the Office has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received on a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the complete document. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acceptable for entry.	1. 🛛 The	amendment filed on <u>07 June 2010</u> under 37 CFR 1.312 ha	s been considered, and has been:
c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below. e) ☑ entered in part. See explanation below. Applicant has submitted three proposed Rule 312 Amendments to the specification after the Notice of Allowance of 13 May 2010. The first is an amendment or deletion of page 1: lines 4–8. The second is an amendment of page 5: line 3 8–21. The third is an amendment of page 5: line 23 − page 6: line 10. The first amendment is DENIED. Applicant indicates that "a new 'Related Applications'' section is to be inserted in the specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the 'Related Applications' section, or if Applicant intended to add or change the references to related applications and the omission of any such applications is in error. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and if the prosecution history of the related applications contains citations to prior art that would require the allowance of the claims in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be DENIED. See MPEP § 714.16. The second amendment is ENTERED. This amendment appears to only correct a latent typographical error, the specification. The third amendment is DENIED. Although the amendment appears to only correct a typographical error, the specification. The third amendment is DENIED. Although the amendment appears to only correct a typographical error in the specification. The third amendment is DENIED. Although the amendment appears to only correct a typographical error in the specification and the order of the communica	a) 🗌	entered.	
Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) disapproved. See explanation below. e) dentered in part. See explanation below. Applicant has submitted three proposed Rule 312 Amendments to the specification after the Notice of Allowance of 13 May 2010. The first is an amendment or deletion of page 1: lines 4–8. The second is an amendment of page 5: lines 8–21. The third is an amendment of page 5: line 23 – page 6: line 10. The first amendment is DENIED. Applicant indicates that "a new 'Related Applications' section is to be inserted in the specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the "Related Applications," such applications or if Applicant intended to add or change the references to related applications and the omission of any such applications in error. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and if the prosecution history of the related applications contains citations to prior art that would require the allowance of the claims in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be DENIED. See MPEPS 714.16. The second amendment is ENTERED. This amendment appears to only correct a typographical error, the Office has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received an a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the emplete document. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acc	b) 🗌	entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the so	cope of the invention.
and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below. e) ☑ entered in part. See explanation below. Applicant has submitted three proposed Rule 312 Amendments to the specification after the Notice of Allowance of 13 May 2010. The first is an amendment or deletion of page 1: lines 4–8. The second is an amendment of page 5: lines 8–21. The third is an amendment of page 5: line 23 – page 6: line 10. The first amendment is DENIED. Applicant indicates that "a new 'Related Applications'' section is to be inserted in the specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the "Related Applications" section, or if Applicant intended to add or change the references to related applications and the omission of any section, or if Applicant intended to add or change the references to related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and if the prosecution history of the related applications contains citations to prior at that would require the allowance of the claims in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be Divide prior at that would require the allowance of the claims in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be Divide error, the Defice has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received no an fourth page of the communicatio	c) 🔲	disapproved because the amendment was filed after the	payment of the issue fee.
d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below. e) ☑ entered in part. See explanation below. Applicant has submitted three proposed Rule 312 Amendments to the specification after the Notice of Allowance of 13 May 2010. The first is an amendment or deletion of page 1: lines 4—8. The second is an amendment of page 5: lines 8—21. The third is an amendment of page 5: line 23 — page 6: line 10. The first amendment is DENIED. Applicant indicates that "a new "Related Applications" section is to be inserted in the specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the "Related Applications section, or if Applicant intende to add or change the references to related applications and the omission of any such applications is error. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications are applications at that would require the allowance of the claims in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be DENIED. See MPEP § 714.16. The second amendment is ENTERED. This amendment appears to only correct a latent typographical error, the Officion has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received on a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the complete document. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acceptable for entry.		· ·	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
e) entered in part. See explanation below. Applicant has submitted three proposed Rule 312 Amendments to the specification after the Notice of Allowance of 13 May 2010. The first is an amendment or deletion of page 1: lines 4–8. The second is an amendment of page 5: lines 3–21. The third is an amendment of page 5: line 23 – page 6: line 10. The first amendment is DENIED. Applicant indicates that "a new "Related Applications" section is to be inserted in the specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the "Related Applications" section, or if Applicant intende to add or change the references to related applications and the omission of any such applications is in error. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and applications and in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be DENIED. See MPEP § 714.16. The second amendment is ENTERED. This amendment only corrects a latent typographical error in the specificant. The third amendment is DENIED. Although the amendment appears to only correct a typographical error, the Offiction has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received on a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the complete document. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acceptable for entry.		and the required fee to withdraw the application from i	ssue.
Applicant has submitted three proposed Rule 312 Amendments to the specification after the Notice of Allowance of 13 May 2010. The first is an amendment or deletion of page 1: lines 4–8. The second is an amendment of page 5: lines 8–21. The third is an amendment of page 5: line 23 – page 6: line 10. The first amendment is DENIED. Applicant indicates that "a new 'Related Applications'' section is to be inserted in the specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the "Related Applications' section, or if Applicant intende to add or change the references to related applications and the omission of any such applications is in error. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and if the prosecution history of the related applications contains talctions to prior at that would require the allowance of the claims in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be DENIED. See MPEP § 714.16. The second amendment is ENTERED. This amendment only corrects a latent typographical error in the specificant. The still of amendment is ENTERED. This amendment appears to only correct a typographical error, the Officion has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received on a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the complete document. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acceptable for entry.	d) 🗌	disapproved. See explanation below.	
2010. The first is an amendment or deletion of page 1: lines 4–8. The second is an amendment of page 5: lines 8–21. The third is an amendment of page 5: lines 23 – page 6: line 10. The first amendment is DENIED. Applicant indicates that "a new 'Related Applications'' section is to be inserted in the specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the 'Related Applications' section, or if Applicant intended to add or change the references to related applications and the omission of any such applications is in error. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and if the prosecution history of the related applications contains citations to prior art that would require the allowance of the claims in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be DENIED. See MPEP § 714.16. The second amendment is ENTERED. This amendment only corrects a latent typographical error in the specification. The third amendment is DENIED. Although the amendment appears to only correct a typographical error, the Office has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received an a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the pendlet document. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acceptable for entry.	e) 🛚	entered in part. See explanation below.	
specification, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applicant intended to cancel the "Related Applications" section, or if Applicant intende to add or change the references to related applications and the omission of any such applications is in error. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of related applications, the amendment would require additional search by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would be subject to double patenting rejections against the related applications and if the prosecution history of the related applications contains citations to prior art that would require the allowance of the claims in the present application to be withdrawn, and so would still be DENIED. See MPEP § 714.16. The second amendment is ENTERED. This amendment only corrects a latent typographical error in the specification. The third amendment is DENIED. Although the amendment appears to only correct a typographical error, the Office has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received on a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the omplete document. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acceptable for entry. ///Mehrdad Dastouri/	2010.	The first is an amendment or deletion of page 1: lines 4-8	
The third amendment is DENIED. Although the amendment appears to only correct a typographical error, the Office has received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received on a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the online placement. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acceptable for entry. //Mehrdad Dastouri/	specifi or if Ap error. search related	cation, but does not present any text. It is unclear if Applia oplicant intened to add or change the references to relate. Note that if Applicant's intent was to modify the list of relat by the examiner to determine if the allowed claims would a applications and if the prosecution history of the related is	ant intended to cancel the "Related Applications" section, applications and the omission of any such applications is in ed applications, the amendment would require additional be subject to double patenting rejections against the applications contains citations to prior art that would require
received an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that the remainder of this amendment was intended to be received on a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 2010, but the Office has not received the complete document. Since it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional corrections to the affected paragraph, the incomplete substitute paragraph is not acceptable for entry. //Mehrdad Dastouri/ //D. N. W./	The se	econd amendment is ENTERED. This amendment only co	prects a latent typographical error in the specification.
	receive receive Since	ed an incomplete replacement paragraph. It appears that ed on a fourth page of the communications filed 7 June 20 it is unknown if Applicant intended to make additional com	the remainder of this amendment was intended to be 10, but the Office has not received the complete document.